

Appl. No. 10/685,760

Atty Dkt. No. 114208-017

Response to Office Action mailed Jan. 11, 2005

REMARKS

The Office Action was issued on pending claim 1-12. Claims 1-12 stand rejected. In this Response, claims 1, 3, 6 and 8-12 have been amended, claims 2, 4 and 5 have been cancelled without prejudice, and claims 13-16 have been added. Thus, claims 1, 3 and 6-16 are pending in the application.

Applicant invites the Examiner to call Applicant's Representative to discuss any issues with this application.

ALLOWABLE CLAIMS

Page 6 of the Office Action states that claims 4, 5 and 9-11 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. §112, 2nd paragraph, and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant thanks the Examiner for the notice of allowable claims.

Independent claim 1 has been amended to include allowable claim 4 and intervening claim 2. Claim 3 has been rewritten in independent form and to include allowable claim 5. The claims have also been amended to correct informalities and to clarify the claims. Claims 2, 4 and 5 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 13-16 have been added. Claim 13 corresponds to claim 7, but depends from claim 3. Claims 14 and 15 correspond to claims 8 and 9, respectively, but depend from claim 13. Claim 16 corresponds to claim 12, but depends from claim 3. Thus, Applicant submits that all of the claims are allowable.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 1, 3, 8 and 12 were objected to as containing informalities. Claims 1, 8 and 12 have been amended to correct the informalities and clarify the claims. Claim 3 has been cancelled without prejudice. The amendments merely correct informalities and clarify the claims.

Thus, Applicant submits that the objections to the claims have been overcome.

Appl. No. 10/685,760

Response to Office Action mailed Jan. 11, 2005

Atty Dkt. No. 114208-017

DRAWINGS

The drawings were objected to at page 2 of the Office Action as failing to show the claimed convex portion of the leaf spring. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Fig. 11 clearly shows the convex portions 32 of a leaf spring 4. The specification clearly describes the leaf spring shown in Fig. 11 as having the convex portions 32. See the specification at page 16, line 12 – page 17, line 6. Thus, Applicant submits that the objection to the drawings should be withdrawn.

SPECIFICATION

The Office Action at page 3 objected to the specification as containing informalities. In response, the specification has been amended to correct the informalities as suggested by the Examiner. The specification has been further amended to correct other informalities and to clarify the specification. For example, the specification and the Abstract have been revised to replace “an allowance” with “play” to more clearly describe that there is play between the engagements. The amendments are supported by the application as originally filed and do not contain new matter.

The Office Action at pages 3 and 4 objects to the specification as failing to provide an enabling disclosure explaining how the first holding portions and the second holding portions are disposed such that they are shifted from each other in a longitudinal direction when the body and the cover are assembled. Applicant respectfully disagrees. However, the specification has been amended at page 13 to clarify the specification. The amendment to page 13 of the specification clarifies the written description with reference to Figs. 7 and 9, and thus, is supported by the application as originally filed. New matter has not been added.

Thus, Applicant submits that the objections to the specification should be withdrawn.

Appl. No. 10/685,760

Response to Office Action mailed Jan. 11, 2005

Atty Dkt. No. 114208-017

CLAIM REJECTIONS

At page 4 of the Office Action, claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. At pages 4 and 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. The claims have been amended to clarify the claims, including the amendments suggested by the Examiner. As to the §112, first paragraph, rejection of claim 6, Applicant submits that claim 6 is enabled for the reasons that the specification complies with the enablement requirement.

At pages 5 and 6 of the Office Action, claims 1, 2, 3, 7 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Mizuno (US 5,664,330). As discussed above, independent claims 1 and 3 and there respective dependent claims are allowable. Claim 2 has been cancelled without prejudice. Thus, the §102(b) rejections should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the patent application is in condition for allowance and requests a Notice of Allowance be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

EVEREST INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW GROUP

Date: April 12, 2005

BY



Michael S. Leonard, Reg. No. 37,557

P.O. Box 708

Northbrook, IL 60065

Phone: (847) 272-3400